

REMARKS

This is a Supplemental Response to the Response filed on May 17, 2005 in response to the Office Action mailed November 30, 2004. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 9, and 26 have been amended and claim 5 has been cancelled, without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested. As will be discussed below, it is also requested that all of claims 1-3, 6-11, and 13-42 be found allowable as reciting patentable subject matter.

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended during the telephone interview conducted on September 20, 2005.

Claims 1-3, 6-11, and 13-42 are pending and under consideration.

Independent claims 1 and 9 and related dependent claims are rejected in view of SIP, IETF RFC 2543 March 1999 (Handley), 3G TS 33.102, and U.S. Patent No. 6,477,644 to Turunen (Turunen). The Office Action took the position that Handley and Turunen disclose all the aspects of independent claims 1 and 9 and related dependent claims. It is respectfully asserted that the combination of Handley and Turunen fail to teach or suggest all the recitations of independent claims 1 and 9 and related dependent claims. Reconsideration is respectfully requested

Handley generally describes HTTP-digest base authentication for SIP and refer to PGP as being a new scheme defined in RFCC 2015. However, Handley does not teach or

suggest that “the request for authentication including information that the authentication will be performed using a Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS) Authentication and Key Agreement (AKA) mechanism wherein a field therein comprises AUTN (authentication token) and RAND (random challenge), wherein RAND and AUTN vectors are included in a SIP WWW-Authenticate or a Proxy-Authenticate response header field,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 9. It is recognized in the Office Action that Handley does not explicitly disclose the authentication associated with mobile systems listed as follows: an authentication performed using a Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS) Authentication and Key Agreement (AKA) mechanism as recited in independent claims 1 and 9.

Handley is silent as to teaching or suggesting, “RAND and AUTN vectors are included in a SIP WWW-Authenticate or a Proxy-Authenticate response header field,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 9. Thus, the recitations of independent claims 1 and 9 further clarify the present invention and place the application in better form to be in condition for allowance. As a continuation to the telephone interview conducted with the Examiner, it is respectfully indicated that the preambles of independent claims 1 and 9 clearly provides a purpose or intended use of the invention. The preamble of independent claim 1 clearly recites the purpose of the invention by providing a method of authenticating a user agent to a server using Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) messages. Similarly, independent claim 9 provides a program storage device readable by a machine, tangibly embodying a program of instructions executable by the machine to perform a

method of authenticating a user agent to a server using Session Initiation Protocol (SIP) messages.

In addition, section 6.3.3 and Fig. 8 of Handley only discloses a process for authentication of the user to establish a new pair of ciphered integrity keys between VLR/SGSN and the USIM using 3GPP specific protocols. However, there is no teaching or suggestion in 3G TS 33.102 of a SIP or non-3GPP specific protocols. Turunen was presented by the examiner solely to support motivation to combine Handley with Turunen. Thus, a combination of Handley and Turunen would fail to teach or suggest, “wherein a field therein comprises AUTN (authentication token) and RAND (random challenge), and RAND and AUTN vectors are included in a SIP WWW-Authenticate or a Proxy-Authenticate response header field,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 9.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention recites subject matter which is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited prior art. Applicants further submit that the subject matter is more than sufficient to render the claimed invention unobvious to a person of skill in the art. Applicants therefore respectfully request that each of claims 1-3, 6-11, and 13-42 be allowed and this application pass to issue.


If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by

telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the Applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time.

Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,


Alicia M. Choi
Registration No. 46,621 -

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

AMC:cvl